DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 570 HE 033 410

AUTHOR	Pusser, Brian
TITLE	AGB-UVA Symposium on Research and Scholarship on Higher Education [Governance, Trusteeship and the Academic Presidency] (Charlottesville, VA, December 5-6, 1999). Occasional Paper.
INSTITUTION	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	AGB-OP-41
PUB DATE	2000-09-00
NOTE	21p.; Symposium sponsored by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036 (members, $5.95; nonmembers, $9.95). Tel: 202-296-8400 or 800-356-6317 (toll-free); Fax: 202-223-7053; Web site: http://www.agb.org.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	College Administration; College Presidents; *Educational Research; *Governance; Governing Boards; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; Politics of Education; Trustees
IDENTIFIERS	Corporatism

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the proceedings of the 1999 Symposium on Research and Scholarship on Higher Education Governance, Trusteeship, and the Academic Presidency sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and the Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia. The symposium addressed the state of research into higher education governance. A group of 23 notable higher education leaders and researchers participated. Plenary session 1 addressed "Higher Education's Future in the Corporatized Economy." Plenary session 2 discussed "New Approaches to Research on Leadership and Governance." Plenary session 3 was "Academic Governance: New Light on Old Issues." A concluding session, "Taking Stock," discussed what disciplinary approaches participants would encourage to further research on the issue and what consequential projects and influential literature might illuminate these issues. Emerging themes and new directions included: interdisciplinary approaches; corporatization or commercialization; legitimacy and moral authority; changing institutional structures and dynamics; the role of the president; assessment and measurement; institutional responsiveness; effective public boards; new politics of higher education governance; and incentives and rewards. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 446 570

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

AGB

OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 41

AGB-UVA Symposium on Research and Scholarship on Higher Education

By Brian Pusser

Leaders in higher education need a broadened arsenal of research into how trusteeship, governance, and the academic presidency can respond to societal changes that are transforming our institutions. Through a generous grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, AGB teamed up with the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education to host a symposium addressing the state of research into higher education governance. Twenty-three notable higher-education leaders and researchers gathered in Charlottesville, Va., on December 4-5, 1999, to explore promising areas of future inquiry.

This summary of those proceedings offers AGB members and higher education researchers some fresh concepts that could enhance future doctoral and other research projects. We thank the participants, particularly Brian Pusser, who prepared this summary, and the three scholars who wrote the papers that formed the basis of the symposium's discussions. (See page 3 for the list of papers.)

We also thank our colleagues whose planning, participation, and insights helped ensure the symposium's success, among them Thomas C. Longin and Merrill P. Schwartz of AGB, and Bennett G. Boggs of the University of Virginia.

We welcome reactions to these papers from our colleagues at other groups such as the American Educational Research Association and the American Association for Higher Education.

The project would not have been possible without the support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Such backing allows us to retain high hopes that our endeavor will exert an important impact on the governance of our nation's higher education institutions.

David W. Breneman, Dean
Curry School of Education
University of Virginia

Richard T. Ingram, President
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Lenn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE033410

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

AGB

OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 41

AGB-UVA Symposium on Research and Scholarship on Higher Education

By Brian Pusser

Leaders in higher education need a broadened arsenal of research into how trusteeship, governance, and the academic presidency can respond to societal changes that are transforming our institutions. Through a generous grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, AGB teamed up with the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education to host a symposium addressing the state of research into higher education governance. Twenty-three notable higher-education leaders and researchers gathered in Charlottesville, Va., on December 4-5, 1999, to explore promising areas of future inquiry.

This summary of those proceedings offers AGB members and higher education researchers some fresh concepts that could enhance future doctoral and other research projects. We thank the participants, particularly Brian Pusser, who prepared this summary, and the three scholars who wrote the papers that formed the basis of the symposium's discussions. (See page 3 for the list of papers.)

We also thank our colleagues whose planning, participation, and insights helped ensure the symposium's success, among them Thomas C. Longin and Merrill P. Schwartz of AGB, and Bennett G. Boggs of the University of Virginia.

We welcome reactions to these papers from our colleagues at other groups such as the American Educational Research Association and the American Association for Higher Education.

The project would not have been possible without the support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Such backing allows us to retain high hopes that our endeavor will exert an important impact on the governance of our nation's higher education institutions.

David W. Breneman, Dean
Curry School of Education
University of Virginia

Richard T. Ingram, President
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

In the past two decades, the academic community's researchers and practitioners have wrestled with a shortage of useful research on higher education's mission and systems of governance. Indeed, a 1985 *Change* magazine article by education consultant George Keller, which discussed the problem under the rubric "trees without fruit," was echoed in a recent *Review of Higher Education* article by Adrianna Kezar, director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. "Higher Education at the Millennium," her title asked, "Still Trees Without Fruit?"

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges confronted this problem by convening a symposium last December. Joining with the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, it assembled a diverse group of scholars and university leaders to discuss ways to enhance research and scholarship on contemporary higher education governance, trusteeship, and the academic presidency. To focus the discussion and to help refine an ambitious charge, plenary sessions were organized around research paper presentations by three distinguished scholars (see the box on page 3). Those plenary sessions, the discussions that followed each presentation, and the collaborative closing session enabled participants to reflect on a rapidly shifting terrain and to propose future directions for research in this arena.

Plenary Session 1: Higher Education's Future in the "Corporatized" Economy. James Mingle opened the symposium by challenging the participants to contem-

Brian Pusser *is an associate professor at the Curry School of Education, University of Virginia.*

plate a markedly altered future for higher education, one shaped by instability, polarization, change, success, and failure—on an unprecedented scale. Mingle envisioned a future characterized by what evolutionary scientist Stephen J. Gould has called "tragic optimism," a somewhat stark reinterpretation of Lindblom's pioneering (1959) model of organizational adaptation. In *The Science of Muddling Through*, Lindblom suggests that administrative leaders, and by extension their institutions, are rational to a fault. Their preoccupation with perceived constraints restricts their focus to "relatively few values and relatively few alternative policies among the countless alternatives that might be imagined." As a result, institutions only slowly muddle through the policy process and a narrow set of choices. According to Gould, there is a significant consequence resulting from the slow pace of institutional response. While institutions muddle, large elements of society suffer as they wait for social institutions to generate solutions.

Mingle noted that higher education institutions are sources of success and of optimism, but that they also are capable of failure and of contributing to economic and social polarization. He suggested that universities now find themselves isolated from many strata of society and increasingly challenged to contribute to the collective well-being and to the economic and social success of university graduates. The extent to which our institutions of higher education will succeed in the 21st century will depend on how universities respond to four powerful trends, or "drivers of change": changing demographics; shifting labor force demands; new technologies; and the "corporatization," or commercialization, of higher education.

Beginning with demographics, Mingle pointed out that racial and ethnic diversity are increasing at all levels of higher education. This trend is perhaps most notable in rapidly growing states of the Sunbelt and in those with significant immigration, such as California, where the majority of high school graduates today are non-white. Demographic shifts in turn are driving political and economic changes in these states, with significant implications for institutional policy. The controversies over affirmative action in California, Texas, and Florida, for example, have mobilized groups traditionally disenfranchised by the higher education system. The racial-ethnic

OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 41 SEPTEMBER 2000

The AGB Occasional Paper Series addresses current and emerging issues of concern to board members and administrators in the context of their institutional settings. Some titles in the series are commissioned by AGB; others are the work of the reputable individuals or groups whose work comes to our attention. This series of publications is intended to inform debate and discussion, not to represent or imply endorsement by the association of its members.

AGB distributes complimentary copies of new titles in the Occasional Paper Series to chief executives and board chairs of member institutions. Individuals may purchase additional copies at a nominal charge by calling 202/296-8400 or writing to AGB, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington D.C. 20036. The association grants permission to its members to photocopy and distribute this paper. Copyright © 2000 Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. All rights reserved.

Richard T. Ingram
President

Richard D. Legon
Executive Vice President

Daniel J. Levin
Vice President for Publications

Thomas C. Longin
Vice President for Programs and Research

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

makeup of student bodies at elite public institutions in several states now bears little relationship to the overall racial-ethnic distribution in those states. This raises powerful concerns about future political and economic support for some of our most prestigious institutions.

Age distribution within the population also is a key concern. That the American population is aging has been well documented, but the myriad ramifications of that shift much less so. Mingle pointed out the social-welfare costs of an aging population and discussed the political interests of that group—interests that often diverge from those of students or families with children. One result is that higher education institutions increasingly are vulnerable to competition for state social-welfare funding, as demonstrated in research by Callan and Finney (1997) and Hovey (1999) that predicts significant structural deficits in state higher education funding for years to come. Given the approaching "tidal wave" of higher education enrollments over the next two decades (Breneman, 1997), the need to serve more students with reduced levels of state funding will continue to present a monumental challenge to governance.

A second trend is the evolving nature of the global production process and the attendant shifts in demand for work-force skills. Universities are faced with a dual challenge—first, to assess the rapidly changing market for work-force skills and competencies and second, to determine the degree to which curricula should be reshaped to meet those changing demands. The need to strike a balance between preparing students for new work-force demands and the desire to provide liberally educated graduates constitute significant challenges for university leaders.

Universities have rapidly increased curricular offerings specific to information technology (IT) skills training, yet they have been slow to infuse IT skills across the curriculum. There is a significant political component to the challenge of meeting labor force demands. State legislators, leaders of the business community, parents, and others have divergent interests, and they often make contradictory demands on the university as it endeavors to prepare students for success in the labor force and in life. As Mingle pointed out, there is not yet a consensus in the research community or the broader political community on what form that preparation should take.

The need to strike a balance between preparing students for new work-force demands and the desire to provide liberally educated graduates constitute significant challenges for university leaders.

A third trend, the growth of information technology, is at once one of the most highly publicized and poorly understood influences on contemporary higher education. In part this can be attributed to the myriad and complex ways in which IT will reshape university activity. Distance-education programs, for example, serve both as effective ways to reach out to traditionally underserved populations and as more efficient methods for serving traditional consumers of higher education. New forms of delivery also are altering curricular content and pedagogy. Virtual classrooms increasingly incorporate advanced audio, video, and database technologies that require instructors who have mastered new competencies. For-profit and nonprofit

Symposium Papers

This Occasional Paper is the first in a series of four commissioned by AGB to help the association determine its research agenda. The papers and their authors are listed below. For additional information on the Charlottesville Symposium, see pages 4-5.

No. 41 **"AGB-UVA Symposium on Research and Scholarship on Higher Education," by Brian Pusser**

No. 42 **"Academic Governance: New Light on Old Issues," by Patricia J. Gumport**

No. 43 **"New Approaches to Research on Leadership and Governance," by Annette Kolodny**

No. 44 **"Higher Education's Future in the 'Corporatized' Economy," by James R. Mingle**

CHARLOTTESVILLE SYMPOSIUM

his paper was one of four prepared for the Symposium on Research and Scholarship on Higher Education Governance, Trusteeship, and the Academic Presidency sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and the Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia. It was held on December 5-6, 1999, in Charlottesville and included the participants listed here.

Bennett G. Boggs	**Special Assistant to the Dean Curry School of Education University of Virginia**
David W. Breneman	**University Professor and Dean of the Curry School of Education University of Virginia**
Joseph C. Burke	**Director, Higher Education Program Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government**
Harvey Goldstein	**Professor University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill**
Patricia J. Gumport	**Executive Director National Center for Postsecondary Improvement School of Education, Stanford University**
James Hearn	**Professor of Educational Policy and Administration University of Minnesota at Twin Cities**
Donald Heller	**Assistant Professor of Education Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education University of Michigan**
Richard T. Ingram	**President Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges**
D. Bruce Johnstone	**Assistant Professor of Education Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education University of Michigan**
Charles B. Knapp	**Senior Fellow Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges**

institutions alike increasingly offer courses and degrees online as they endeavor to hold and increase market share. The result may be a powerful challenge to what Zemsky (1998) has called the "traditional geographic monopolies" of higher education institutions, with major implications for accreditation, assessment, coordination, and governance.

The IT revolution also will have significant implications for academic support services and administrative work. New technologies, according to Mingle, make possible an increased "functional integration" and a convergence across institutional borders, similar to the spread of online courses across state boundaries. Functional integration may enable institutions to share administrative, computing, and library systems as a method of increasing productivity and reducing costs.

Attention also must be devoted to the growing "digital divide," given that access to information technology and institutional IT capacity varies considerably across the country and between higher education sectors (College Board, 1999). The cost of technology is such that the role of private capital markets in the

Annette Kolodny	**Professor of Comparative Cultural and Literary Studies and former Dean of the College of Humanities University of Arizona**
David W. Leslie	**Professor of Education College of William and Mary**
Thomas C. Longin	**Vice President for Programs and Research Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges**
Judith Block McLaughlin	**Chair, Harvard Seminar for New Presidents Director, Higher Education Program Harvard University**
Margaret A. Miller	**President American Association for Higher Education**
James R. Mingle	**Executive Director State Higher Education Executive Officers**
Richard Novak	**Director of Public Sector Programs Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges**
Barbara L. Perkins	**Director, Zwingle Resource Center Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges**
Brian Pusser	**Assistant Professor Curry School of Education University of Virginia**
Merrill P. Schwartz	**Director of Special Projects Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges**
Myra H. Strober	**Programs Officer in Higher Education Atlantic Philanthropic Services**
Alton Taylor	**Professor Curry School of Education University of Virginia**
Michael S. Teitelbaum	**Demographer Alfred P. Sloan Foundation**

production of higher education is likely to be increasingly significant. Whether that capital goes into new start-up colleges and universities, distance education providers, or partnerships with for-profit subsidiaries of historically nonprofit institutions will significantly affect the emerging landscape.

The role of capital also is central to Mingle's fourth trend: the commercialization of higher education. Commercialization is evident in a number of aspects of contemporary university revenue generation, particularly in funded research activities and royalties from partnerships with for-profit concerns. The trend toward commercialization also has touched the academic core, as universities increasingly market courses and knowledge products online. The commercialization of the curriculum has raised concern and engendered litigation over issues such as the ownership of faculty labor, syllabi, and pedagogical methods. Noble (1998), Slaughter and Leslie (1997), and others have expressed concern that commercialization has the potential to abridge the traditional agreements that have defined the ownership of intellectual capital, the appropri-

ate compensation for faculty labor, and the role of faculty in university decision making. The management of the potential conflicts between faculty and administration over technological distribution of "intellectual capital" is emerging as a significant challenge to academic governance.

Mingle concluded by reflecting on the management of conflict that arises as university presidents, boards, faculty, and administrators attempt to reconcile the contradictory demands emerging from the trends and changes. He mentioned the civil disobedience at the recent World Trade Organization meetings in Seattle as a possible indicator of the level of discontent with global commercialization and corporate influence. He also remarked on the homogenous character of U.S. governing boards, calling for increased diversity; he suggested that writers, artists, and musicians might provide balance to a system increasingly headed by "academic politicians."

Discussion. Given the breadth of Mingle's paper, it was remarkable that the subsequent discussion focused primarily on two issues: the commercialization of the university and the loss of moral and intellectual stature of the institution and its leadership. Annette Kolodny agreed that there has been increased emphasis on commercial aspects of the university and an accompanying shift away from its role as the guardian of intellectual work and knowledge creation. She noted that the contemporary university president generally is on the road raising funds, while the provost has become the manager of the academic disciplines. With faculty increasingly divided along disciplinary lines and distracted by esoteric conflicts and ideological wars, the result is a loss of legitimacy and an environment in which no one has the stature or perspective to speak for the institution. Mingle added that the perceptions Kolodny alluded to are magnified by the growing tendency of institutions and their leaders to adopt the language of business and the techniques of corporate America.

Margaret Miller suggested these factors also contribute to the increasingly "corporate" nature of governing boards, both in terms of membership and style. Richard T. Ingram predicted that at the board level this could be a short-lived trend, as open meeting laws and increasing public activism may reduce the appeal of serving on higher education governing boards for those with corporate experience.

Myra Strober pointed out that the growth of commercial enterprise creates imbalances in the resource base within campuses and increasingly constrains open debate and academic freedom. She wondered whether academic commercialization will "cost us our souls." Joseph Burke added that the drive to increase funded research and move up in the prestige hierarchy has diminished the institution's sense of collectivity to the extent that it is hard to imagine who could resist the commercialization of higher education. Michael Teitelbaum raised the issue of "unfunded research" at prestigious institutions—research generated during faculty time subsidized by lower teaching loads. He argued that these activities invoke many of the same problems generally attributed to funded research.

The growing imbalance between sectors of higher education was identified as another key organizational and governance challenge. Ingram asked whether the more successful higher education institutions will move to work with less successful organizations to find solutions or isolate themselves from the challenge. If the institutions choose the latter course, he wondered, how many are in danger of "selling their souls?"

David Breneman brought up the growing entrepreneurial approach to managing disciplines and colleges within higher education institutions. He noted that in part this is driven by a move to "unbundling," where each unit is expected to be self-sufficient and there is a diminishing sense of obligation to subsidize units that generate less revenue. He suggested that market-like behaviors by nonprofit institutions will continue to be driven to a degree by increasing competition from for-profit institutions.

Harvey Goldstein cautioned that the contemporary debate on university resource allocation might over-emphasize the importance of research in the broader political economy of higher education. Many legislators, for example, prefer that universities emphasize undergraduate learning as a form of direct human capital development. He suggested that we need a new way of account-

ing the costs and benefits generated by different areas within the university, because existing measures do not sufficiently capture the non-economic impacts of the enterprise. Don Heller agreed on the need for improved measures of productivity and measures that reflect conditions in different sectors.

Kolodny urged further discourse on the need to develop a compelling narrative other than "economic development" as the defining characteristic of the contemporary university. She said that "building social capital" would be a stronger and more inclusive narrative. D. Bruce Johnstone ended the session with a call for a new university *raison d'etre*, something that would help end the erosion of public trust in institutions and their boards.

Plenary Session 2: New Approaches to Research on Leadership and Governance. In the initial planning stages of this symposium, a fundamental challenge was articulated: How can we generate innovative research projects that will address emerging governance challenges? While higher education literature and the popular press contain a fair amount of debate over governance, trusteeship, and the presidency, little contemporary research has been conducted to advance our understanding of these dynamics. The key works in the field are all based on research conducted in previous settings, works such as Berdahl (1971) on institutional autonomy, Millet (1984) on coordination and conflict, Kerr and Gade (1989) and Chait et al (1991) on trusteeship, Birnbaum (1988) on academic leadership, and Ingram (1993) on governing boards.

While this body of scholarly inquiry has not been rendered obsolete by the passage of time, the institutional contexts in which it was created have significantly changed. Further, the disciplinary lenses brought to bear on any number of other contemporary institutions have broadened considerably over the past two decades. The study of the dynamics of Congress, for example, has been infused with theoretical perspectives and models adopted from economics, anthropology, legal studies, sociology, and critical and postmodern perspectives. Over the same period of time, new research on governance in higher education has continued to be based largely on organizational sociology and shaped by a relatively narrow set of theoretical perspectives.

The discrete organization of departments and disciplines is particularly problematic in a world moving toward the blurring of boundaries and the breaking of barriers.

To address this issue, Kolodny focused her paper "New Approaches to Research on Higher Education Leadership" on new methodological and theoretical bases for research on governance structures and processes.

Kolodny portrayed an emerging context for higher education similar to the one envisioned by Mingle. It is a world shaped by shifting technologies that demand new knowledge bases, skill sets, and technical proficiency. She pointed to a key distinction between the creation of new technology and the application of that technology. She suggested that the appropriate knowledge base for applying technology judiciously is located in the liberal arts, because of their attention to critical thinking and diversity. Today's college graduates face a world of complexity, ambiguity, and instability, she argued, and such a world requires undergraduates who are trained to comprehend the "systems, patterns, and interconnections that characterize a global, knowledge-based economy."

Unfortunately, said Kolodny, universities are fragmented, disconnected, and uncommunicative entities, which means they are poorly organized to adapt to an interdisciplinary world. The discrete organization of departments and disciplines is particularly problematic in a world moving toward the blurring of boundaries and the breaking of barriers. This problem is compounded by the fact that the various fiefdoms within the institution have developed distinct cultures, some unique rules, and, perhaps most important, different vocabularies.

As an example of the divide, Kolodny described her efforts to reduce class sizes in

language courses when she was dean at the University of Arizona. Her belief at the time was that a lower student-instructor ratio would improve interactions, increase student participation, and lead to improved learning outcomes. Her understanding was that minimizing the failure and dropout rate, while increasing student success, would constitute a more *efficient* use of resources than requiring teachers to teach ever larger classes. However, for several of her state governing board members, and for the provost to whom Kolodny reported, only an increased ratio of students to teachers was considered *efficient.*

That the same word could be used to describe such contrasting approaches points to a polarization in language and culture within and across academic institutions. As a result, Kolodny suggested, "meaningful dialogue has become impossible," and a climate of mistrust and misunderstanding prevails. Efforts to change that climate are complicated by the hierarchical organizational structure dominant in higher education institutions, one characterized by tightly controlled information and incremental change that does not lend itself to rapid adaptation or innovation.

Kolodny also related her experience in attempting to change institutional policies on promotion and tenure by replacing a hierarchical structure with what she termed "inclusive team decision making." Efforts to build institutional community stand in stark contrast to the prevailing culture of academic rewards, the culture that encouraged external peer review and prestige over local collaboration. By restructuring traditional lines of authority, breaking down barriers to open discourse, and horizontally redistributing decision-making power, institutional leaders could create a new context in which innovative policies and procedures could be adopted.

Discussion. The personal experiences of many symposium participants were brought to bear on this discussion of borders, boundaries, and communication within the academy, and between the academy and the external environment. Judith McLaughlin expanded on the conceptualization of the academy as a series of disparate cultures, suggesting that in order to communicate across institutional cultures, contemporary presidents need to be multilingual and multicultural. She cautioned that even with those competencies, presidents would find the process of navigating organizational cultures hazardous and the pace of change exceedingly slow. Miller contended that departments have developed individual "discourse communities" over time as part of a live-and-let-live process of organizational development. The lack of a common language is particularly problematic for leaders attempting to negotiate beyond academe—in the legislatures, for example, where the common denominator is clear, and the language of power more easily communicated than the language of academic life.

Mingle responded that lack of consensus and the inability of the higher education community to present a united voice also contribute to an impatience with the university among outsiders. This impatience is manifest in demands from legislators and board members that academe "get its act together." Not only are the various discourse communities within higher education institutions a mystery to outsiders, he added, so are the institutions' various planning and budgetary schema. The lack of transparency in central university affairs is a continuing source of frustration to those within the university and its external constituencies.

Teitelbaum noted that despite considerable commentary on "interdisciplinary programs," the disciplines currently are more analogous to silos, to the extent that faculty in various disciplines rarely even know one another. He suggested looking to institutions that incorporate greater interdisciplinarity—Oxford College or Evergreen, for example—to see whether structures are in place that contribute to community building or incentives for faculty to collaborate.

Ingram offered an example of how cultural divides in the academy impact governing boards and governance processes. He suggested that presidents sometimes work to keep faculty and trustees at a distance because of a lack of confidence in faculty leaders as true representatives. Those presidents' perceptions are in accord with Kolodny's observations on the increasing conflict within academic senates, a dysfunction created in part by the lack of incentive for faculty to take meaningful leadership positions.

David Leslie related these various strands to an essential problem: a lack of a sense of community within colleges and universities. He warned that we can no longer afford to be what Jim March termed "organized anarchies." Leslie said we must turn attention to building a sense of colleges and universities as democratic societies, and he suggested that an overarching organizing framework for community building in the humanities might be something like, "Citizenship in a Democratic Society." He also alluded to the issue of incentives and rewards, pointing out that even when the ideas of community and civic responsibility are promoted, junior faculty often are uninterested, as the tenure and promotion process offers few dividends for community building.

Strober moved the discussion to the stress generated in the lives of presidents, provosts, and deans. She noted the decreasing tenure in office of university leaders and wondered who would aspire to such positions under contemporary conditions. Teitelbaum extended the issue to encompass faculty lives. He asked whether academic careers over time have evolved to become incompatible with human life cycles, and he commented that most faculty don't know until their mid-thirties whether they have a career, a situation that is personally daunting and ill-suited to reproduction and family success.

Plenary Session 3: Academic Governance: New Light on Old Issues. Patricia Gumport began her presentation of the symposium's final paper, "Academic Governance: New Light on Old Issues," by setting out a framework for thinking about university responsiveness from a sociological perspective. Drawing on the work of famed sociologist Emile Durkheim, Gumport proposed that organizational evolution can be explained in part as a product of differentiation introduced over time in the interest of reducing organizational conflict. She suggested that as institutions grow in complexity, they face increasing internal competition for resources. One way to lessen that conflict within a department, for example, has been to establish new program areas.

Gumport also invoked the work of Burton Clark (1993), who suggested that universities continually are required to respond to rising expectations and to choose among demands for new knowledge, training, and economic development. Clark described this challenge as "the problem of complexity" and noted that a fundamental response to demands for complexity has been differentiation.

Universities continually are required to respond to rising expectations and to choose among demands for new knowledge, training, and economic development.

Gumport suggested that the problem of complexity has long been a challenge to the governance and leadership structures of higher education, yet little empirical work has been conducted on the questions of how academic leaders understand their environments, prioritize elements of institutional mission, or reconcile competing demands. These questions entail presumptions about internal and external constituencies, about individual institutional cultures and legitimacy.

Gumport offered organizational sociology as a discipline that has provided useful insight into organizational responsiveness, incorporating studies of authority in academic organizations, loose coupling in decision making, and the management of symbolism. She cited two recent works of organizational sociology that are noteworthy for their holistic approach to managing change: Leslie and Fretwell's *Wise Moves in Hard Times* (1996) and Clark's *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities* (1998).

Gumport pointed to two enduring challenges in higher education governance: the growing chasm between management and governance and the conflict between collective and individual interests. With regard to the former, she drew a distinction between shared governance and academic management. George Keller (forthcoming) suggests that shared governance in higher education (defined as institutional guidance with significant input and authority accorded to full-time faculty) is on the decline. In its stead, new

forms of academic management and management styles have emerged, characterized by hierarchical and cost-conscious approaches. In response, faculty have retreated from institutional governance into increasingly independent pursuits.

Keller suggests that faculty have ceded considerable authority to academic managers at the same time that faculty expect to have a dominant voice in appointment and tenure, curriculum approval, and program restructuring. Coupled with increasingly contentious academic senate processes, the result has been a growing divide between faculty and university administrators.

The second fundamental challenge Gumport addressed was introduced with the observation by Clark Kerr (1995) that universities are sites of tension between collective and individual interests. The result is a chasm between the institutional common good and individual self-interest. Gumport pointed out that in a contemporary academic culture that rewards competition over collaboration, faculty endeavor to maximize their own individual good, pledging primary allegiance to their careers, often at the expense of the interests of the institution. The resulting fragmentation is so pronounced that in a recent series of interviews with university presidents, Gumport found that many were reluctant to "speak for the whole" at their institutions for fear of being seen as self-interested.

This tension also is reflected at the institutional level, as academic units jockey for favorable position in the increasingly competitive resource queue, and at the system level, as campuses compete with one another for advantage. Under these circumstances, it becomes increasingly difficult to move the debate, as Gumport characterized it, from "yours and mine" to "ours."

Gumport concluded by reiterating the call for work addressing efforts to manage organizational change (Schuster, Smith, Corak and Yamada, 1994), for case studies of contested policymaking (Pusser, in press), and for increased attention to the enduring importance of knowledge creation.

Discussion. Mingle opened the discussion by returning to the need to strive for functional integration. He agreed that knowledge creation might be a unifying point for that integration, but that fragmentation and specialization will continue to reshape academic institutions into smaller units. Brian Pusser suggested that we might want to revisit research on differentiation in light of contemporary contextual shifts. He pointed to the unprecedented size of recent corporate mergers and to the consolidation of higher education institutions in the for-profit sector. In both instances, the need to increase market share may outweigh the desire to differentiate. He noted that the question of how organizational conflict will be resolved in an environment of consolidation may emerge as a key area for future consideration.

Leslie addressed the question of who speaks for the whole of the institution by suggesting that no one does, with good reason. He pointed out that in a democratic institution conflict is endemic and a source of progress. Johnstone disagreed, stating the president does, or at least should, speak for the whole. Merrill Schwartz then questioned whether we realistically can expect presidents to speak for the whole of an increasingly fragmented and complex institution.

McLaughlin pointed out that individualism and fragmentation extends to student groups and student governance as well as to administration. She also felt that we lack a compelling narrative for why members of the institution should "hang together." With regard to speaking for the whole, she asked, "Why would anyone want to?" Breneman suggested that internal institutional markets are working against coalition building and are rapidly increasing fragmentation, as evidenced by the resource and salary differentials between law and business schools and the humanities.

Ingram followed up by pointing to other powerful divides in higher education institutions. He offered such examples as the balkanization of groups on the campuses, the divergent interests of public and private institutions and the national and state organizations that represent them, and the interest group competition taking place at the level of state boards and legislatures. In addition to asking who speaks for the whole, he recommended we ask, Who calls the shots?

Goldstein responded that external business interests and economic development pressures

call the shots. He asserted that the concept of the whole is a myth that obscures the increasing trend to fragmentation and the vector of competing interest groups that dominate decision making, as well as the widespread legitimacy crisis in internal governance mechanisms. He concluded that the reason there is so much uninterest in academic senates is that academic senates have no power.

Chuck Knapp used earlier comments on institutional representation to reflect on governing boards. He suggested that although boards are entities that we might expect would "speak for the whole," for the most part, that is not something they do. Indeed, they are increasingly less willing to speak for the whole and seem at present to be far more likely to express narrow, parochial interests. Unfortunately this "activist" phenomenon increasingly resembles "single issue" interest-group politics, rather than a positive avenue for boards and board members to speak for the institution.

Rich Novak raised the issue of the role of the boards in management and governance changes at the institutional level. He felt we would benefit from research on decision making at the board level in general, and more specifically, on why boards encourage certain types of change and resist others.

Ingram closed by reminding participants that, given the increasing influence of external stakeholders, researchers and practitioners need to become good listeners. Rather than turning away from demands, we need to turn attention to the question of what are the legitimate interests of the stakeholders and how higher education can accommodate those interests.

Concluding Session: Taking Stock. Pusser opened the concluding session by asking the participants to discuss what disciplinary approaches they would encourage in order to further research on the presidency, trusteeship, and governance, and to suggest some of the consequential projects and influential literature that might illuminate those issues.

Breneman led off by noting the absence of a body of scholarship on the politics of higher education and suggested that we would benefit from a strong political theory of higher education institutions. Jim Hearn followed up with a similar call for a political theoretical approach. He cited Kingdon's work on agenda control and March and Cohen's institutional literature as being particularly helpful in research on the politics of organizations.

We need to turn attention to the question of what are the legitimate interests of the stakeholders and how higher education can accommodate those interests.

Strober recommended more interdisciplinary work, noting that her own field, economics, has not contributed much on governance at this point. She said she hoped attention can be paid to the physical and emotional toll of higher education on leadership roles, to the question of what sort of people we are encouraging to enter leadership, and to the implications of these issues for gender distribution in leadership positions.

Burke thought research will be useful on the issue of how to encourage interdisciplinary collaboration. He pointed to the health care industry as a site of comparative analysis.

Teitelbaum suggested a focus on two issues that emerge from research on performance indicators. First, how well do we understand the way in which performance measures are currently applied? He referred to the increasing tendency to use prestige as an indicator, as evidenced by the growth in attention to the *U.S. News & World Report* rankings. Given how little is generally known about the nature of those measures, he also said we will benefit from more-transparent indicators of productivity and quality. The second issue is the way in which performance indicators actually shape institutional change, Teitelbaum said. He recalled Churchill's comment that "Men build buildings, and then they build us" to suggest that the measures we use may in turn shape our perceptions of institutional performance in ways not yet understood.

Leslie quoted the American statesman Yogi Berra to the effect that "you can see a lot by just looking." He advocated a less structured

approach to research on governance, beginning with an inventory of what is occurring in institutions and followed by a process of case study and sense making.

Rich Novak reiterated that much more can be done in the politics of higher education. Interest-group pressure is a key component that needs to be illuminated, along with the pressure of moneyed interests on the boards, the level of intrusion that accompanies that pressure, and the influence on autonomy. He also suggested that differentiating between single campuses and state systems will yield quite different perspectives on the role of the president.

Tom Longin said that in-depth work on institutional governance will be particularly rewarding if it focuses on identifying the legitimate players in contemporary decision making, the models that decision makers use, and the circumstances in which they use them.

Johnstone asked why governors behave as they do, and whether there has been a change over time in the role of governors. He called for longitudinal mapping of successful institutions and presidencies so that we may better understand the long-term effect of key policies and the lives of presidents at various points in their terms.

Alton Taylor agreed that the role of governors should be a site for future study. He asked why governors are imposing harsh accountability measures during a time when the economy is booming. He also said that the role of information technology and board behavior will be increasingly important in the future.

Mingle was another advocate of interdisciplinary study and research focused on financial incentives, particularly at the macro-level. He offered two areas for future study: (1) the role of financing in shaping structure and mission and (2) the challenge of dealing with an emerging generation of board leaders who fundamentally are political leaders.

Barbara Perkins supported research on the types of literature used in the study of higher education institutions. She suggested that we have tended to rely on literature from organization studies and nonprofit management and that we might benefit from including findings from psychology, economics, and management literature.

Knapp advocated interdisciplinary studies focused on the issues of agenda setting and the substantive differences in the various stakeholders' agendas for higher education. He said that the state summits that Novak will be organizing could prove extremely useful for evaluating contemporary state government and higher education agendas.

McLaughlin called for a tightly focused research agenda. She argued that where the unit of analysis is too broad, as in the case of studies of national trends, they fail to shed much light on any particular issue. She suggested ethnographic case studies of specific aspects of the emerging governance challenge. Her preference would be for studies of open meeting laws, and she also endorsed interdisciplinary approaches.

Don Heller called for studies of higher education's leaders and their roles in delineating the university's public trust to the institution and the broader society. These studies might also concentrate on how boards and board members can restore the public perception of the individual and social returns to higher education.

Schwartz pointed to the significant body of work emerging from studies of organizations and corporations. She cited the book *Built to Last* by James C. Collins and Jerry I. Porras as an example of a case study of organizations with solid leadership and a vision for the future, and she suggested that similar studies of higher education institutions would be a valuable contribution.

Kolodny repeated Strober's earlier call for a study that would generate a better understanding of the people the jobs presently attract and the implications the conditions of these positions have for gender and racial-ethnic diversity in hiring. Kolodny commented that presidents have uniquely constrained personal lives. She wondered how the lack of time for family life and personal intimacy shapes president's positions on family-care policies, maternity leave, and the like and suggested that these questions could be part of a study of good and bad models of organizational decision making.

Emerging Themes and New Directions for Future Research. The paper presentations and subsequent discussions illuminated a number of significant areas for future research and pointed to innovative disciplinary and meth-

odological approaches for addressing those research challenges. These can be grouped around ten central themes that emerged from the symposium.

1. Interdisciplinary Approaches. Applying interdisciplinary approaches to research on governance, trusteeship, and the presidency was a recurring theme of the symposium. Kolodny recommended that future research on higher education governance be increasingly derived from studies of cross-cultural communication, ethnography, socio-linguistics and social anthropology. These studies would follow in the tradition of the work of John Gumperz on cross-cultural communication, Claudia Strauss on communicative diversity within otherwise apparently homogenous groups, and George Marcus on the ethnography of corporate culture. She suggested that special attention be directed to Deborah Tannen's work on gender and discourse styles, as the increasing presence of women in management and leadership positions will require improved understanding of gendered discourse in leadership.

It was suggested that governance research would be further enhanced through study of emerging theories of information flows within organizations taken from industrial-organizational psychology, study of the new theories of networking from business and economics, and work on redefining constituencies from community studies. Given the complexity of higher education institutions and the multiple layers of authority and representation inherent in governance and trusteeship, it was generally agreed that the traditional governance and leadership research paradigm would benefit from the richness generated by an expanded theoretical and methodological approach.

2. Corporatization, or Commercialization. Commercialization was seen as directly affecting governance, trusteeship, and the presidency in a variety of ways. The pursuit of new revenue sources through external partnerships with industry seems to tangle the lines between internal and external control of the institution. The need for increased commercial revenue also has forced presidents to expand their efforts beyond the campus to raise the institution's visibility in the competition for funds. The discussion of the twin pressures of raising funds and managing the institution raised concerns that the academic presidency is an increasingly untenable position.

The pursuit of new revenue sources through external partnerships with industry seems to tangle the lines between internal and external control of the institution.

Commercial revenue also was seen as narrowly distributed, with certain schools and programs receiving disproportionate revenue. This in turn increases internal stratification and contributes to the growing conflict between "yours and mine" and "ours" noted by Gumport. The growth in patent licensing, for-profit subsidiaries, and industry-university partnerships was seen as presenting a number of significant implications for institutional norms of open debate and scientific disclosure. Mingle cautioned that a number of ethical issues were raised by partnerships with for-profit entities and that universities should weigh their obligations as public trusts when contemplating new forms of partnership.

It was suggested that research on commercialization would benefit from the study of models of for-profit and nonprofit behavior, as well as longitudinal studies on the change over time in various revenue sources for institutions in various sectors of higher education. Mingle suggested that future research might address how governing boards can best be constituted in order to buffer the institutional mission against the demands of a rapidly evolving market for higher education

3. Legitimacy and Moral Authority. Another theme that received significant attention was the erosion over time of the role of higher education institutions as voices of moral authority and sites of social legitimacy. A number of explanations for this erosion were put forward and linked to the question of who represents the "voice of the institution." The

increasing complexity of the institutions, the failure to control costs, the shift of attention from undergraduate training to funded research, and the increasingly political nature of governance were all cited as contributors to the decline in public trust.

The question of higher education's role as a public trust also was linked to institutional legitimacy. With elite higher education institutions charging more for tuition, garnering ever-larger endowments, and attracting national media attention for their successes, concern was expressed over higher education's ability to represent the most disadvantaged members of society and to reclaim its historical mantle as a provider of access and social mobility. Suggestions were made for research based on case studies of institutions with strong reputations for public service and outreach and of institutions with strong governing board commitments to the "public trust." Theoretical frameworks from corporate research on building and communicating successful images and the emerging management literature on institutional social capital (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998) might offer innovative perspectives on these challenges for higher education. Insights from philosophy, particularly perspectives on institutional ethics and obligations, would be usefully applied to the question of institutional voice and to the effort to reclaim the "soul" of the organization.

4. Changing Institutional Structures and Dynamics. The growing complexity of higher education institutional structures and environments was a central theme of the papers presented by Gumport and Kolodny. Each suggested that improving communication and collaboration is essential for successful institutional adaptation. Much of the symposium discussion addressed research that would lead to better understanding of the challenges to communication and collaboration. It was noted that governing boards seem to be ahead of other parts of the institution in "building-in" a commitment to improving communication and working with representatives from various segments of the institution and beyond campus. An analysis of the process used by successful boards and best practices developed through board training might be extended to help narrow the divide between the academic senates and administrative leaders.

Kolodny suggested that understanding of governance dynamics would be advanced by insight into successful "cross-cultural" exchanges between trustees and faculty. Research addressing the structural factors that currently are understood to build community and the factors perceived as barriers to community building, such as institutional size and complexity, was seen as central to advancing change in this arena.

5. The Role of the President. The role of the president emerged as an issue of paramount importance for understanding higher education governance. While this always has been a key area of research, there was a strong suggestion during the symposium that the role of the president has changed rapidly over the past few decades in ways that lead many to wonder whether the position is mutating beyond the ability of anyone to do the job. Conducting case studies of the presidency was recommended as a way to incorporate the collections of personal narratives that could track presidential effectiveness over time. It was suggested that existing research on the presidency and academic leadership could be augmented using recent management literature on leading complex organizations. Our understanding of the increasing physical and emotional toll being taken on modern presidents could be enhanced by findings from psychology and health care, particularly research on stress management.

In light of Birnbaum's (1991) findings that faculty support is key to the longevity of university presidents, it also was suggested that we pursue the question of what has constituted successful presidential and board leadership from the perspective of faculty and other stakeholder groups. How do various groups define the distinction between a "successful president" and a "successful administrator"? Longitudinal tracking of the perspectives of departing presidents and board members with regard to these issues was seen as a quite useful source of data for future research on the presidency.

6. Assessment and Measurement. Another recurring theme was the inability to accurately measure or assess both the broad range of educational outputs and the social contributions made by higher education in particular. A prediction was made that in the absence of

institutional research on this issue, the "high ground" will soon be lost to interest groups and political leaders. Assessments and measurements were seen as fundamental to understanding presidential performance, research. Gumport's distinction between management and governance also might be applied to research on whether contemporary management initiatives impinge on traditional norms of appropriate governance.

How do various groups define the distinction between a "successful president" and a "successful administrator"?

board decision making, and legislative perceptions of higher education governance. It was suggested that researchers begin by establishing definitions of the stakeholders in higher education and the products they expect higher education institutions to provide. A number of disciplines and methods were offered as useful for defining and measuring outputs, including models from the corporate quality movement, theories of goal setting and responsiveness from industrial-organizational literature, and case studies of corporate best practices.

7. Institutional Responsiveness. While we discuss "institutional responsiveness" at some length in higher education literature, symposium participants noted that there is little empirical work on what the phrase actually implies. Research on this topic would begin by pursuing historical data on how responsive higher education has been and on how that level of responsiveness compares with contemporary adaptations. This question would be addressed from a number of different stakeholder perspectives, and, in keeping with Kolodny's findings, it also might entail looking at culture and language as a way to understand contemporary demands. It was hoped that the research might go beyond the standard measures of economic and political consonance and define responsiveness in innovative ways, with attention to such issues as the environment, race relations, overall civic responsiveness, the health of children, income inequalities, and other key social challenges.

Arriving at a better understanding of the role of information in university responsiveness would also be important. To that end, researchers' attention would be turned to board information systems and to the issues of whether boards and presidents receive appropriate information and how they apply that information. Case studies of adaptation and conflict were seen as useful guides to this

8. Effective Public Boards. The need for research on ways of increasing the effectiveness of public boards was cited in a number of symposium discussions. Most helpful, it was agreed, would be case studies of successful boards, inventories of best practices, and analyses of institutional assessments. One proposal put forward was to apply Chait, Taylor, and Holland's (1991) model for identifying competencies and critical success factors to answer the question, "How do we know when a board is doing well?"

There also was agreement on the need for research in the area of quality and productivity measures, to address the question, "How do boards understand quality?" On a broader level, some participants felt that, given the quantity and complexity of data on institutional finances, it would be useful to gather data on how well board members understand the internal allocation and transfer of institutional resources.

A related area of future research would apply Kolodny's concept of "cultural boundaries" to board governance. After identifying key constituencies, a series of key questions could be addressed, such as, Do boards and presidents, trustees, faculty, legislators, and other stakeholders have differing or conflicting senses of purpose? What are the different perspectives/lenses used by different constituents? How do constituents describe the institution and its leadership? How does each group define institutional purpose, and how do board members reconcile these various perspectives?

9. The New Politics of Higher Education Governance. A consensus emerged from the symposium that external political actors and interest groups are increasingly challenging governance structures and processes. These challenges often are generated or supported by governors and legislators, interest groups, and

individual trustees. It was suggested that a shift has taken place in the "politics of higher education" such that political issues are increasingly manifest in direct pressure on governing boards and through increasing external political contest over board decisions (Pusser, 2000).

The role of governors was seen as key to understanding future conflict, and it was suggested that research on gubernatorial impact could be linked to the forthcoming "report card" on the efficacy of higher education in various states. The changing nature of the appointment and composition of governing boards, the implication of demands for representation from a rapidly shifting demographic base, and the role of external interest groups were all cited as key areas of future research. It was suggested that theories and models from political science would be usefully brought to bear, and that, given the increasing use of the initiative process and legal challenges, models based in legal theory would provide new and insight as well.

10. Incentives and Rewards. During the symposium, the arrangement of incentives and rewards in higher education was cited as a growing challenge to higher education organization and governance. This issue was central to Gumport's conceptualization of the tension between individual and collective interests in the academy. It was suggested that research on existing models for setting local faculty rewards would be useful, as would a deepened understanding of how external reward systems (disciplinary awards, external research funding, and the like) shape faculty behavior. The incentives and rewards for institutions in various sectors and for disciplines and schools within various types of institutions could be analyzed in the same manner. Economic theories in general, and principal-agent models specifically, were seen as one approach that could be usefully applied to this research. Transaction cost analyses (Williamson, 1995) as applied to understanding incentives in political science models also would be applicable, as would the portion of political philosophy that addresses collective and individual costs and benefits.

Conclusion. The papers presented at this symposium and the ensuing discussions offered a remarkably consistent, albeit somewhat daunting, outlook on the contemporary terrain for higher education governance. The emerging perspective entailed a vision of institutions and their leaders buffeted by rapid environmental change and challenged to respond to a series of complex and often conflicting demands. Higher education institutions were seen as houses divided by often-impermeable internal boundaries, where structure, process, and discourse were created by individuals and groups with distinctly different cultural perspectives, visions, and goals. At the same time, the institutions found themselves increasingly under siege by a range of interest groups, governors, legislators, and activist trustees.

Yet, as the symposium unfolded, a current of optimism emerged. While there was agreement on the magnitude of the task facing presidents, trustees, and scholars of university governance, there also was a strong sense of commitment to a better understanding of the transformations and opportunities ahead. ◆

THE AGB OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

To order copies of AGB Occasional Papers, write the number and title of the paper on the order form on the next page, complete the remainder of the form, and mail or fax it to AGB. All of the following papers are available, as are the 16 published before 1993. For information about those titles, please contact AGB Publications.

1996

25. The "Local Board" in Multicampus Systems and Universities, *by Edgar B. Schick*
26. The New Activism of Corporate Boards and the Implications for Campus Governance, *by Richard P. Chait*
27. Reducing Student Costs and Enhancing Student Learning, *by Alan E. Guskin*
28. Strategic Budgeting: The Board's Role in Public Colleges and Universities, *by Dennis P. Jones*
29. Not So Different After All: Academic and Industrial Leadership in the 1990s, *by Henry E. Riggs*
30. The Urban University in the Community: The Roles of Boards and Presidents, *by John I. Gilderbloom*

1997

31. Prospective Governance, *by Darryl G. Greer*
32. Case Study: How a Commitment to Technology Advanced Our Strategic Plan, *by Richard A. Detweiler*
33. Five Strategic Responses to the Financial Challenges Facing Colleges and Universities, *by Arthur Hauptman*

1998

34. A National Survey of Presidential Performance Assessment Policies and Practices, *by Merrill P. Schwartz*
35. A National Survey of Board Performance Assessment Policies and Practices, *by Merrill P. Schwartz*
36. Composition of Governing Boards of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1997, *by Holly Madsen*
37. Composition of Governing Boards of Public Colleges and Universities, 1997, *by Holly Madsen*

1999

38. Fundamental Challenges for Liberal Arts Colleges, *Essays by Paul Neely and Michael S. McPherson and Morton Owen Schapiro*
39. State University-Related Foundations and the Issue of Independence *by Thomas Arden Roha*
40. Public-Policy Influences on Public College and University Foundation *by Anne H. Moore*

2000

41. AGB-UVA Symposium on Research and Scholarship on Higher Education, *by Brian Pusser*
42. Academic Governance: New Light on Old Issues, *by Patricia J. Gumport*
43. New Approaches to Research on Leadership and Governance, *by Annette Kolodny*
44. Higher Education's Future in the "Corporatized" Economy, *by James R. Mingle*
45. System Heads, Boards, and State Officials: More Than Management, *by E.K. Fretwell Jr.*
46. The Glion Declaration II: The Governance of Universities

Public Policy Papers

1997

2. Transforming Public Trusteeship, *by Richard T. Ingram*

1999

1. Ten Public Policy Issues for Higher Education in 1999 and 2000

Order Form

Individuals affiliated with AGB-member institutions may photocopy and distribute copies of this paper. If you would like additional copies in this format, please use this order form.

Prices for Occasional and Public Policy papers:
AGB Members: $5.95 ($4.95 for ten or more copies of the same paper).
Nonmembers: $9.95 ($7.95 for ten or more copies of the same paper).

Shipping and Handling:

- For orders less than $10 or more than $100, we ship for free.
- $10-$29, add $3
- $30-$49, add $5
- $50-$100, add $7

Standard shipping is by Fourth Class Book Rate, and delivery takes two to four weeks.
Please call for information on special delivery services.

Paper Number or Short Title	Unit Price	Quantity	Total Price
		Subtotal	
		Shipping	
		TOTAL	

Payment Options:
All orders for less than $25 must be prepaid. Make your check or money order payable to AGB, or call to arrange payment by credit card or purchase order.
If your order is more than $25, we'll be happy to bill you.

How to Place Your Order:

- Call AGB toll-free at 800/356-6317.
- Fax your completed order form to 202/223-7053.
- Mail your order form to AGB Publications, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036.

For more information on AGB or to order publications online, visit our Web site at www.agb.org.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone Number _____

The AGB Mission

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) is dedicated to strengthening the performance of boards of public and private higher education. It advances the practice of citizen trusteeship that has distinguished American higher education for more than 350 years. By serving as a continuing-education resource to trustees and boards and by contributing to effective working relationships between boards and chief executives, AGB seeks to strengthen the governance of higher education institutions.

AGB recognizes its leadership responsibilities to members and to a diverse system of higher education. The association strongly believes in citizen control of our colleges and universities, rather than direct governmental control, and works to ensure that higher education remains a strong and vital national asset.

AGB carries out its mission adhering to the following objectives:

- To educate individual trustees and boards on matters that affect their institutional oversight responsibilities.
- To promote wider understanding of and appreciation for citizen leadership and lay governance as the only effective ways to ensure the quality and independence of American higher education.
- To advance the philosophy that all elected or appointed trustees serve in the public trust and should consider themselves trustees of higher education as a whole.
- To strengthen the relationship between trustees and chief executives in the fulfillment of their distinct yet complementary responsibilities.
- To stimulate cooperation with public-policy makers, government agencies, and private organizations that have a stake in the effective governance and quality of colleges and universities.
- To identify and study emerging public-policy issues of concern to higher education by providing forums for their discussion and by encouraging appropriate member initiative.